DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 895 UD 017 041

AUTHOR Southworth, William Dixon
TITLE Title I ESEA Program-Remedial Services for Eligible Non-Public School Pupils Speech Therapy Component.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 35p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-59631

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; *Elementary Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Instruction; Secondary School Students; *Speech Improvement; *Speech Therapy
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report is an evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Approximately 4,812 elementary and secondary non-public school children, drawn from four New York City boroughs and enrolled in the ESEA Reading, Mathematics, and English as a Second Language Program participated in the speech improvement program. The program was staffed by a coordinator, field supervisor, teacher trainer, and qualified speech teachers. Noted educators in speech, language, and education disabilities also participated in the program. The objective of the program evaluation was to determine by standardized testing and teacher judgment whether the severity and number of speech and language deficits had been significantly reduced. Except in kindergarten, eleventh, and twelfth grades where sample sizes were too small, statistically significant differences between pre and posttest scores were found, indicating that the speech and language deficits of the participants were reduced significantly. (Author/BS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED139895

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09 - 59631

TITLE I ESEA PROGRAM-REMEDIAL SERVICES FOR ELIGIBLE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS SPEECH THERAPY COMPONENT

SCHOOL YEAR 1974 - 1975

William Dixon Southworth, Ph.D.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD0 17041

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Mini-narrative

   A. Characteristics of the population served p. 1

   B. Cross reference to other programs

   C. Statement of objectives

   D. Additional evaluation results

2. Chapter I - The Program p. 2

3. Chapter II- Evaluative Procedures p. 5

4. Chapter III- Findings p. 8

5. Chapter IV - Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations p. 13

6. Exemplary Program Abstract p. 23

7. Recommendations p. 24

LISTS TABLES CHARTS

1. Partial List of Supplies p. 10

2. Standardized Test Results(Photo-Artic. Test) p. 15-16

3. Data Loss Form (for Photo-Articulation Test) p. 17

4. Photo-Articulation Test (Stuttering Profile, Voice Scale) p. 18

5. Data Loss Form(for Voice Scale) p. 19

6. Data Loss Form (for Stuttering Profile) p. 20

7. Language Screening Battery Test p. 21

8. Data Loss Form (for Language Screening Battery) p. 22

SPEECH THERAPY NON - PUBLIC

SCHOOL PROGRAM

FALL, 1974 - SPRING 1975

#09 - 59631

A. Characteristics of the population served. The characteristics of the population served by this project do not differ from those presented in the original proposal.

B. Cross reference to other programs. This program gives direct curriculum content support to the activities and aims of the Title I NPS Corrective Reading, Mathematics and ESL program. Referrals to the Title I Guidance Program were made. Children had to be enrolled in the three academic components before they can be enrolled in the Speech Therapy Program. Team teaching and lesson content from these components assured direct cross reference between supportive Speech Therapy and academic component remediation efforts.

C. Statement of objectives The project objectives do not differ from those described in the original proposal.

D. Additional evaluation results. There are no additional evaluation results that are not already included in the MIR report (Section III, Item 30)

CHAPTER I

THE PROGRAM

As part of the umbrella of services to Title I, Non-Public Schools pupils, improvement in Reading and English as a Second Language by children enrolled in Speech Therapy would indicate the value of this program for pupils' academic achievement in the Reading and ESL evaluations.

The approximately 4812 non-public school children participating in the program were selected from among all the children receiving instruction in ESEA Title I, Reading, Mathematics, and ESL . It was the purpose of the program to "... determine whether there is a reduction in the intensity of speech defects in the target population."

In order to implement the aim of the program, speech therapy instruction for the target population began in September, 1974, and continued through the end of June, 1975, the 1974-75 school years.

The program was carried on in the non-public schools of the Bronx, Queens, Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Staten Island. Representative schools in each borough were selected for particular attention by the evaluator, each being seen twice by the evaluator. Six to eight weeks of time separated the first visit to each of the schools from the second visit to each of the same schools.

The program served both elementary and high school students, in large schools and small, in new buildings and old. In each building small group instruction was carried on, groups ranging in size from two to seven students,

the usual size being three or four students. Each teacher worked with six to nine groups , giving instruction to each group in half-hour or forty-five minutes periods, in separate facilities provided for the speech therapy program.

Each school was provided with materials and supplies developed for the specific purpose of helping the children to understand their speech defects, and providing means wherein the children participated very actively in the improvement of their speech by concentrating on the reduction of their speech defects.

Within each group specialized attention was given to the unique needs of each child, even to the point of extra instruction being given to the child over and above the group instruction.

To the end of serving the needsof the individual child, both teacher-made and commercially-prepared materials were provided the children, used by them, and understood by them as being integral to their own speech improvement.

The teachers observed in the program were professionally well qualified, being certificated and experienced in the teaching of speech. Further, they worked in small group instruction modes, thus being able to work effectively and consistently with the individual needs of the children being served. In addition, five speech centers were maintained in the boroughs of the city. These centers concentrated their efforts on working with the severely handicapped, working in close conjuction with the parents of these children. In fact, parents received instructions from the speech therapists in working with the children at home.

3

The city-wide control of the program was located in the central board office. From this office a constant liaison was carried on with the teachers in the field. Also, the field visits to the teachers made by the coordinator, field supervisor, and teacher trainer, 271 visits in all, included a post-lesson conference after each teaching observation.

Six all-day institutes and workshops and two half-day workshops were organized by the coordinator for the teaching staff. In addition, field trips to the Lenox Hill Hospital Vocal Dynamics Laboratories and Special Education Information Materials Center were arranged. Forty-five teacher intervisitations took place. Ten new teachers attended thirty Board of Education two-hour after-school speech workshops. Orientation training days for twelve new teachers w provided before they assumed their duties.

The following noted educators in Speech, Language, and Educational Disabilities participated in the program:

Dr. Harold - Montclair College- Learning Disabilities
Dr. Celia Lavatelli - University of Illinois- Language Development
Dr. Frieda Spivak- Queens College - Remediation of ITPA Disabilities
Dr. Ronald Webster- N.Y.U.- Behavior Modification in Speech Therapy
Dr. William Formaad -Seton Hall - Articulation Therapy Through Play
Ms. Kyla Marion - Speech Teacher- Muscle Training

These specialists participated in the program according to a carefully planned program of comprehensive instruction for the speech teachers participating in the program.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The objective of the evaluation of the program was to determine by standardized testing and teacher judgment if the severity and number of speech and language defects had been reduced, another way of saying that the speech of the children had improved.

The sampling used was the total population that had been pretested and post-tested, that is, the bulk of the children who had been served in the program from October , 1974 to May, 1975. Other, late entrants, were also pre- and post-tested.

The testing was carried on by the individual speech teachers, in accordance with the specifications for testing found in the original evaluation design. The following tests were used singly, as required by each child tested:

1. Photo-Articulation test
2. The Voice Scale
3. The Stuttering Profile
4. The Language Screening Battery Test

Each teacher was given a sheet issued through the Office of the Coordinator that provided space for the recording of all the pre- and post-test scores required. These sheets were collected by the coordinator, given to the evaluator, and then subjected to statistical analyses, primarily by means of a computer programmed for the tests listed above.

The data from the Photo-Articulation Test were subjected to analysis by a correlated "t" test in order to determine if there is a statistical significance between the pre- and post-test scores. A statistical significance between the two sets of scores would indicate effectiveness of the program in reducing speech defects in the target population.

"The Voice Scale" and the "Stuttering Profile" were both developed by the Bureau of Speech Improvement, and were used to "... determine the extent to which there has been a reduction in voice anomalies and arythmia" among the children receiving help in overcoming voice anomalies, "stuttering" and "cluttering".

The data from the Voice Scale and the Stuttering Profile were subjected to the Median Test ,"... as a measure of statistically significant improvement in the reduction of voice anomalies, and in cases of 'stuttering" and 'cluttering' ". A statistical significance between the pre-and post-test scores of the Stuttering Profile would indicate effectiveness of the program in reducing stuttering and cluttering in the target population. A statistically significant result between pre- and post-test scores on the Voice Scale would serve the same function for voice cases.

The data from the Language Screening Battery Test were subjected to the "Sign Test", on a pre-test, post-test basis. Four sub-tests, Auditory Reception, Token Test, Menyuk Sentences, and Detroit Test (Auditory Span), were given. For each sub-test there was a positive score (+) given if the speech defects noted in the pre-test were reduced in the post-test. There was also a

negative score (-) given if the speech defects noted in the pre-test had increased; there was a neutral score (0) given if there was no change. The following grid shows typical scatters of signs and the schema for arriving at composite scores:

Child	Test A	Test B	Test C	Test D
Mxxx	+	+	+	+
Nxxx	+	+	0	-
Oxxx	+	+	0	0
Pxxx	+	-	-	-
Totals	+	+	0	-

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The overall objective of the evaluation of the program was "... to determine whether there is a reduction in the intensity of speech defects in the target population." For all the tests the pupil population was "... all the pupils receiving instruction in articulation."

The Photo-Articulation test was administered on a pre-test, post-test basis, findings being subjected to a correlated "t"test, and a determination made concerning the statistical significance of changes on each grade level.

In order to determine the number of pupils whose articulation defects have been corrected and the pupils discharged, the Photo-Articulation test was administered on a pre-test, post-test basis.

A third basis for testing was that of "... voice anomalies and arythmia." Twotests were administered for determining changes in the specific areas of "stuttering" and "cluttering", those tests being the Voice Scale and the Stuttering Profile.

The fourth test used was the Language Screening Battery Test, consisting of four sub-tests, with a composite score, the Sign Test.

The facilities available to the speech teachers ranged from adequate to excellent. Two teachers taught in windowless, small rooms; but many taught in regular-sized classrooms. All the teachers had satisfactory furniture, and the usual classroom supplies.

The specialized speech therapy materials available to the teachers were excellent, all having been provided

with a wide variety of materials and supplies, a copy of which is attached. The most impressive speech therapy device was a simple plastic device that allowed the student wearing it to hear his own voice immediately after speaking.

Title One - Non-Public Schools
Speech Therapy Program

Partial List of Supplies

TEACHER: DATE:

The following materials are available. Please initial the items you are taking.

	ITEM	INITIAL
1.	ITPA Test	1.
2.	Peabody Articu tion Cards	2.
3.	Peabody Language Dev. Kit and Manual	3.
4.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	4.
5.	L.A.C. Test	5.
6.	Dolch Vowel Lotto	6.
7.	A Workbook for Stutterers, Stennet	7.
8.	Tak-Baks (Blue ear-pieces)	8.
9.	Visual Resource Handbook	9.
10.	Continental Press-Rhyming-Lvl.A,B,C	10.
11.	Continental Press-Thinking Skills;ABC-	11.
12.	Handbook for Speech Correction	12.
13.	Creative Communication, Tanner	13.
14.	Oral English Language Skills	14.
15.	Oral English Teacher's Manual	15.
16.	Teacher Auditory and Language Kit	16.
17.	The Big Book of Lang. Through Sounds -	17.
18.	A Reading Activities Manual to Aid The Disadvantaged	18.
19.	Listen & Speak to Read	19.
20.	Bulletin Board of Basic Phonics	20.
21.	Merrily We Speak	21.
22.	Speech Correction in the Schools,Black-	22.
23.	Organic Voice Disorders, Moore	23.
24.	Perceptual Training Activities Handbook, Van Witsen	24.
25.	The Voice and Voice Therapy,Boone	25.
26.	Stuttering Therapy for Children, Luper	26.
27.	Therapy for Young Stutterers, Emerick-	27.
28.	Piagets Theory Applied to Early Childhood Curriculum	28.

29.	Know Yourself, Guide to Those Who Stutter	29.
30.	Speech Ways, Scott,Thompson	30.
31.	Listening Aids Through the Grades	31.
32.	Articulation Through Play	32.
33.	Correction of Defective Con. Sounds, Nemoy Davis	33.
34.	Aids to Psycholinguistic Teaching	34.
35.	Better Speech and Better Reading, Schoelfield	35.
36.	Improving Skills in Speech Therapy, Wallace	36.
37.	Talking Time	37.
38.	Choral Speaking is Fun, Raubicheck	38.
39.	Let's Have Fun with Speech (Set) R, SH,L,S	39.
40.	My Sound Book -S-G-L-	40.
41.	Inner City Children Can Be Taught To Read	41.
42.	Predictive Screening Test of Articulation Manual	42.
43.	Voice Problems of Children, Wilson	43.
44.	Vocal Rehabilitation	44.
45.	A Child's World-What Goes With What	45.
46.	A Child's World-What Belongs Where	46.
47.	A Child's World-What's Part of What	47.
48.	A Child's World-What Do They Become	48.
49.	A Child's World-What PieceFits	49.
50.	A Child's World-What's the Opposite	50.
51.	Paired Stimuli Technique	51.
52.	Vineland Social Maturity Scale	52.
53.	Phonic Rummy	53.
54.	Phonetic Word Wheel	54.
55.	Progressive Sound Game	55.

The prior study of this program, for the 1973-74 school year, recommended "greater use of the speech and language service in kindergarten, first grade, and second grade..." That recommendations's implementation is exemplified by the increased number of students being served in grades one and two: the 1973-74 report showed 200 children being served in grade one, the 1974-75 report shows 479 children being served in grade one; the 1973-74 report showed 451 children in grade two being served, the 1974-75 report shows 1067 children being served in grade two - increases of 233% and 223%, respectively.

Further, greater use of speech and language service "...can prevent a number of problems; speech problems such as eliminating stuttering and mispronunciations associated with foreign language interference; language problems such as the inability to listen, attend, retain, and understand classroom language. In speech, promoting good English rhythmic patterning, developing a flexibility in use of the articulatory mechanisms, and a good appreciation of appropriate levels of tone and quality of voice; in language promoting an appreciation for creative language activities through story-telling and creative dramatics, as well as instilling basic psycholinguistic abilities; these abilities are prerequisities for reading, writing, spelling

and speaking effectively."

The recommendations made in the 1974 evaluation have been carried out in the following ways:

1. Speech therapy is not carried on in a vacuum, that is, the materials used have value in themselves, in addition to their therapeutic value. For instance, the use of children's physical coordination is promoted by their actually walking through such activities that demonstrated "before" "behind," "above", "below", and similar words. Children were learning important space concepts not, in themselves, related solely to speech therapy.
2. The speech therapy program necessitated reading, thus, the speech therapy teachers promoted the development of reading skills and appreciation among the children. Likewise, the use of number lines on the floor promoted spatial and number concepts, both in the cardinal and the ordinal aspects of number relations.
3. Particularly on the high school level, extensions of the basic speech therapy components of the program were carried out most successfully. Specifically, the matter of polite and pleasant verbal modulations of what and how the students spoke had much interested student involvement, and obvious good results.

The program serviced the needs of the children in the specific target population for which it was designed.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major findings of the study are predicated primarily on the evaluations of differences in the number of defects had by the children before and after the speech instruction of this program.

The Photo-Articulation test was administered on a pre-and post-test basis. In general terms, the improvement of the children in the program through reduction of speech defects is as follows:

With the exceptions of Kindergarten, grades Ten, Eleven and Twelve, there was significant differences in the values obtained at the .001 level. Grade Ten showed significance at the .01 level. Kindergarten, grades Eleven and Twelve did not show statistical significance because the sample used was too small. The conclusion can thus be drawn that, with the exception of the grades listed directly above, the post-test of the Photo-Articulation test showed significant improvement over the pre-test.

The two tests, Voice Scale and Stuttering Profile, were given on a pre- and post-test basis. The results were centered in grades one through eight, there being no scores for kindergarten, grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve. The reasons for the small numbers in kindergarten and grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve is that there is only a small number of children with these anomalies percentage-wise in the target population, and the number of children in the tar-

get population in the areas of kindergarten, and grades nine through twelve are consequently very small. Further, the number of students served in the nine-through twelve area is very small, in comparison with the total target population. Also, since the Voice Scale and the Stuttering Profile measure in areas most difficult to correct, it cannot be expected that there will be results comparable with those shown on the articulation tests.

By way of further amplification, the median test is applied to determine the extent of improvement of those pupils diagnosed as having voice and rhythm deficiencies, using the Stuttering Profile and Voice Scale, as designed by the Office of Educational Evaluation and accepted as the evaluation design by the State Education Department.

The Language Screening Test Battery consists of four sub-tests: Auditory, Reception, Token Test, Menyuk Sentences, and Detroit Test (auditory span). All four sub-tests were given to students referred by Title I Reading, Mathematics, and English as a Second Language teachers, as children in need of oral-aural language remediation. The composite score of the pre-test was compared with the composite score of the post-test.

Test results show very high percentages of students discharged in K through 8th grade. Ninth grade is anomalous, there being no numerical bases for statistical consideration. Grades ten, eleven, and twelve show such small numbers of students tested that no statistical conclusion can be drawn from the testing. However, in light of the State Department directive that the highest priority be given to grades one through three, it is to be expected that there would be few high school students.

Use Table 30C. for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to tables 30A. and 30B.

30C. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

51

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used[1]	Form Pre	Form Post	Level Pre	Level Post	Total N[2]	Group ID[3]	Number Tested N[4]	Number Tested Score Type[5]	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD[6]	Posttest Date	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD[6]	Statistical Data Test[7]	Statistical Data Value[8]	Statistical Data Level[9]
64622	720	Photo-Artic.	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	K	6	6	10/74	15.5	9.81	5/75	9..17	7.05	Corr. "t"	2.375	*
64623	720	"	"	"	"	"	268	1st	245	6	"	16.87	7.51	"	10.04	6.22	"	20.25	.001
64623	720	"	"	"	"	"	729	2nd	632	6	"	13.97	6.36	"	7.87	5.16	"	33.23	.001
64623	720	"	"	"	"	"	657	3rd	548	6	"	12.96	6.15	"	7.18	5.02	"	29.8	.001
64624	720	"	"	"	"	"	498	4th	407	6	"	11.75	5.41	"	6.31	4.60	"	27.21	.001
64624	720	"	"	"	"	"	411	5th	341	6	"	11.76	5.34	"	6.58	4.67	"	22.92	.001
64624	720	"	"	"	"	"	339	6th	264	6	"	11.57	5.22	"	5.99	4.49	"	23.59	.001
64625	720	"	"	"	"	"	197	7th	150	6	"	12.04	5.81	"	6.77	5.13	"	15.72	.001

1/ Identify Test Used and Year of Publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and post test calculations.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = Z Score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ S.D. = Standard Deviation
7/ Test statistic (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value
9/ Specify level of statistical significance obtained (e.g., $p \leq .05$; $p \leq .01$).

19

20

* Wherever a sample size was too small(N of 7, or less), no level of significance is given.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS SPEECH THERAPY COMPONENT Function #09-59631

Use Table 30C. for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to tables 30A. and 30B.

30C. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

51

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used[1]	Form Pre	Form Post	Level Pre	Level Post	Total N[2]	Group ID[3]	Number Tested N[4]	Number Tested Score Type[5]	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD[6]	Posttest Date	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD[6]	Statistical Data Test[7]	Statistical Data Value[8]	Statistical Data Level[9]
64625	720	Photo-Artic.	NA	NA	NA	NA	103	8th	84	6	10/74	12.02	5.60	5/75	6.69	4.96	Corr. "t"	2.53	.001
64626	720	"	"	"	"	"	58	9th	13	6	"	9.85	4.52	"	4.62	4.17	"	6.65	.001
64626	720	"	"	"	"	"	29	10th	8	6	"	9.75	5.42	"	2.75	1.04	"	4.11	.01
64626	720	"	"	"	"	"	3	11th	2	6	"	9.00	1.41	"	4.0	2.83	"	5.	*
64626	720	"	"	"	"	"	7	12th	4	6	"	12.5	7.9	"	5.0	2.16	"	1.9	*
64627	720	"	"	"	"	"	3305	K-12	2704	6	"	12.97	5.98	"	7.21	8.09	"	67.66	001

1/ Identify Test Used and Year of Publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and post test calculations.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = Z Score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ S.D. = Standard Deviation
7/ Test statistic (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value
9/ Specify level of statistical significance obtained (e.g., $p \leq .05$; $p \leq .01$).

21

22

Non-Public School Pupils
Speech Therapy Component

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09 - 59631

A - moved D - withdrawn
B - discharged E - absent
C - transf. F - schedule conflict

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) %	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
6 4 6 2 2	7 2 0	K	Photo-Artic.	6	6	0	0	--	
6 4 6 2 3	7 2 0	1st	"	268	245	23	8.5%	A-10; C-11; E-2	23
6 4 6 2 3	7 2 0	2nd	"	729	632	97	13.3	A-51; B-7; C-29; D-5; E-2; F-3	97
6 4 6 2 3	7 2 0	3rd	"	657	548	109	16.5	A-42; B-9; C-46; D-12	109
6 4 6 2 4	7 2 0	4th	"	498	407	91	18.3	A-23; B-29; C-29; D-10	91
6 4 6 2 4	7 2 0	5th	"	411	341	70	17.	A-26; B-12; C-23; D-6; E-3	70
6 4 6 2 4	7 2 0	6th	"	339	264	75	22.1	A-14; B-11; C-32; D-18	75
6 4 6 2 5	7 2 0	7th	"	197	150	47	24.	A-13; B-13; C-13; D-8	47
6 4 6 2 5	7 2 0	8th	"	103	84	19	18.	A-6; B-6; C-7	19
6 4 6 2 5	7 2 0	9th	"	58	13	45	78.	A-7; D-4; F-34	45
6 4 6 2 6	7 2 0	10th	"	29	8	21	72.	A-3; D-11; F-7	21
6 4 6 2 6	7 2 0	11th	"	3	2	1	33.	B-1	1
6 4 6 2 6	7 2 0	12th	"	7	4	3	43.	C-3	3
				3299	2698	601	18.2		601
23									

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

PHOTO-ARTICULATION TEST

	VOICE SCALE				STUTTERING PROFILE			
Grade	No. enrolled	No. pre-post-tested	loss	%	No. enrolled	No. pre-post-tested	loss	%
K	1*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1st	2 *	2	0	0	10	9	1	10
2nd	14	13	1	7	7	7	0	0
3rd	15	15	0	0	10	8	2	20
4th	18	17	1	5.5	20	19	1	5
5th	21	21	0	0	21	21	0	0
6th	23	21	2	8.7	21	20	1	4.8
7th	19	16	3	16.	11	10	1	9
8th	4 *	4	0	0	7	3	4	57.
9th	0 *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10th	1 *	0	1	100.	0	0	0	0
11th	1 *	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
12th	4*	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	123	115	8		107	97	10	

25

* Since the sample size runs less than seven, no significance can be attributed to it statistically.

The test does not account for improvement of children, rather it accounts for the decrease in speech deficits. Thus, while the total number of speech deficits may remain the same, the reduction in severity of deficits is not apparent.

Non-Public School Pupils Speech Therapy Component

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09 - 59631

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
641622	720	K	Voice Scale	1	1	0	0	--	
641623	720	1st	"	2	2	0	0	--	
641623	720	2nd	"	13	12	1	7.7	Discharged - 1	1
641623	720	3rd	"	15	15	0	0	--	
641624	720	4th	"	18	17	1	5.5	Discharged - 1	1
641624	720	5th	"	21	21	0	0		
641624	720	6th	"	23	21	2	8.7	Discharged - 1; Moved - 1	2
641625	720	7th	"	19	16	3	15.8	Discharged - 2; Moved - 1	3
641625	720	8th	"	4	4	0	0		
641625	720	9th	"	0	0	0	0		
641626	720	10th	"	1	1	0	0		
641626	720	11th	"	2	2	0	0		
641626	720	12th	"	3	3	0	0		
				122	115	7	5.7		7

27

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

Non-Public School Pupils
Speech Therapy Component

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09 - 59631

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used Stuttering	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed %	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	(6) Number/ Reason
6 4 6 2 2	7 2 0	K	Profile	0	0	0	0	--	
6 4 6 2 3	7 2 0	1st	"	9	9	0	0	--	
6 4 6 2 3	7 2 0	2nd	"	7	6	1	14.3	Moved - 1	1
6 4 6 2 3	7 2 0	3rd	"	8	6	2	25.	Moved - 2	2
6 4 6 2 4	7 2 0	4th	"	19	18	1	5.3	Moved - 1; Discharged - 1	2
6 4 6 2 4	7 2 0	5th	"	21	21	0	0	--	
6 4 6 2 4	7 2 0	6th	"	20	19	1	5.	Discharged - 1	1
6 4 6 2 5	7 2 0	7th	"	10	9	1	10.	/Discharged - 1	1
6 4 6 2 5	7 2 0	8th	"	3	3	0	0		
6 4 6 2 5	7 2 0	9th	"	0	0	0	0		
6 4 6 2 6	7 2 0	10th	"	0	0	0	0		
6 4 6 2 6	7 2 0	11th	"	0	0	0	0		
6 4 6 2 6	7 2 0	12th	"	0	0	0	0		
				97	91	6	6.1		6

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

LANGUAGE SCREENING BATTERY TEST

NUMBER AND PERCENT DISCHARGED

Grade	No. Enrolled	No. pre-post-tested	+ No.	+ %	− No.	− %	0 No.	0 %
K	12	12	9	75	1	8	2	17
1st	199	181	160	88	5	3	16	9
2nd	317	271	233	86	8	3	30	11
3rd	233	191	171	90	5	3	15	7
4th	171	133	111	83	4	3	18	14
5th	107	81	64	79	4	5	13	16
6th	113	79	64	81	3	4	12	15
7th	55	36	30	83	1	3	5	14
8th	29	22	19	86	0	0	3	14
9th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10th	25	6	4	57	0	0	2	33
11th	11	7	4	57	2	29	1	14
12th	5	5	2	40	0	0	3	60
Totals	1277	1024	871	85	33	3	120	12

Non-Public School Pupils
Speech Therapy Component

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09 - 59631

A-moved
C-transfer
D-withdrawn

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used Lang. Screen. Battery	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) %	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
641622	702	K	"	12	12	0	0	--	
641623	702	1st	"	199	181	18	9.	A-7; C-7; D-4	18
641623	702	2nd	"	317	271	46	14.5	A-33; C-13;	46
641623	702	3rd	"	233	191	42	18.	A-25; C-17	42
641624	702	4th	"	171	133	38	28.5	A-19; C-19	38
641624	702	5th	"	107	81	26	24.2	A-13; C-13	26
641624	702	6th	"	113	79	34	30.	A-0 ; C-34	34
641625	702	7th	"	55	36	19	34.5	A-0; C-19	19
641625	702	8th	"	29	22	6	24.1	A-2; C-2; D-2	6
641625	702	9th	"	0	0	0	0	--	0
641626	702	10th	"	25	6	19	76.	A-6; C-5; D-8	19
641626	702	11th	"	11	7	5	36.3	A-0; C-2; D-3	5
641626	702	12th	"	5	5	0	0		
				1277	1024	253	19.9		253

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

31. EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT:

If you operated a component of more than 60 hours of treatment with results which showed gains (norm referenced) in excess of one month's gain for each month of treatment or operated a component of less than 60 hours of treatment with results which showed (criterion-referenced) that at least 90% of the population demonstrated mastery of the objectives, please abstract the aspects of the component which appear to account for the unexpected results. Such examples can thus be duplicated and made readily available through the New York State Educational Programs to other school districts as well as State and Federal agencies that are interested in replicating successful projects. Identify the component by code and provide a one page summary of the findings in relation to the objectives.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code
64622	720	816

through 64626 Component Abstract

The exemplary aspect of the program is amply documented by the statistical information given above, insofar as statistical information represent a part of the proof of the effectiveness of the program . Consistently, the teachers in the field showed a professional competence in speech teaching that was not only superior, but that also manifested itself in the universal rapport enjoyed by the teachers and the children in the program, and the extraordinary lengths to which the teachers went to enrich the program by development of specific materials for the needs of specific children.

The rapport was further corroborated by the eagerness that children repeatedly manifested in continuing in the program, and the pleas of other children not in the program to be admitted to it. Being in the peech therapy program carried with it a status among the participants and their peers that was as unexpected as it was universal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above information, and observations, it is recommended that:

1. The program be renewed and expanded. The effectiveness of the program just completed is clearly superior. Repeatedly, principals in the field and teachers in the field have told the evaluator that so many more children could be served, children who need serving, if the program could be expanded to give more time for instruction of the children. No tax levied money for Speech in the non-public schools in New York City Board of Education budget has been used in this program. If this program is eliminated, there is no assurance that any speech-handicapped Title I youngster will be given speech therapy next year.
2. That additional teachers be hired. The services of those teachers would be distributed according to needs of the children in the non-public schools, based on the joint evaluation by principals in the field, the teachers in the field, the coordinator of the program, worked in conjunction with the Speech Department for the New York City schools.